

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are in the case. Claims 1-10, 12-17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 over USPN 6,370,487 to Dorough in view of USPN 5,926,208 to Noonan et al., and further in view of USPN 5,845,166 to Fellegara et al., and claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC § 103 over Dorough in view of Noonan et al. and further in view of Fellegara et al., and further yet in view of USPN 6,512,858 to Lyon et al. Claims 1 and 15 are hereby amended. No new matter is added by the amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §103

Independent claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, a system for inspecting a substrate, with a sensor that produces a video stream, a control interface, a network to transport the video stream and the control stream, a desktop having a display to present the video stream and user interface controls to control operation of the inspector by use of the control stream, and a parser to selectively crop the video stream prior to delivery of the video stream to the desktop, where the selective cropping reduces a size of the video stream and produces a cropped view and reduces a size of the video stream, and a *location* of the cropped view within a full video frame of the video stream *is remotely selectable* from the desktop via the control interface.

Applicants first compare the primary reference against the elements of the claim as recited above, to determine wherein the primary reference is deficient. Then the secondary references are analyzed to determine whether they compensate for the deficiencies detected in the primary reference. If all of the references are deficient as to the same element or combination of elements, then the claim is patentable over the cited references.

Dorough does not describe, among other things, the control interface, and the parser that selectively crops the video stream prior to delivery of the video stream to the desktop, where a location of the cropped view within a full video frame of the video stream is remotely selectable from the desktop via the control interface.

Noonen et al. do not compensate for the deficiencies of Dorough, in that Noonen et al. also do not describe cropping the video stream prior to delivering the video stream to the desktop, where the selective cropping reduces a size of the video stream, and a location of the cropped view within a full video frame of the video stream is remotely selectable from the desktop via the control interface.

Similarly, Fellegara et al. do not compensate for the deficiencies of Dorough and Noonen et al. in that Fellegara et al. also do not describe cropping the video stream prior to delivering the video stream to the desktop, where the selective cropping reduces a size of the video stream, and a location of the cropped view within a full video frame of the video stream is remotely selectable from the desktop via the control interface.

Thus, claim 1 patentably defines over Dorough in view of Noonen et al. and further in view of Fellegara et al. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 1-10 and 12-14 depend from independent claim 1, and contain additional important aspects of the invention. Therefore, dependent claims 1-10 and 12-14 patentably define over Dorough in view of Noonen et al. and further in view of Fellegara et al. Reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 1-10 and 12-14 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 15 claims, *inter alia*, a system for inspecting a substrate, with an inspector having a sensor, a control interface, a network, a desktop for receiving the video stream and the control stream, a display and user interface controls to control operation of the inspector across the network, a compressor to selectively compress the video stream, a decimator to selectively down sample the video stream, a parser adapted to selectively crop the video stream prior to delivery of the video stream from the sensor to the desktop, where the selective cropping produces a cropped view and reduces a size of the video stream, and a *location* of the cropped view within a full video frame of the video stream *is remotely selectable* from the desktop via the control interface, and a codec to selectively set a frame rate of the video stream, where the selective cropping reduces a size of the video stream.

Thus, claim 15 also claims the parser that selectively crops the video stream prior to delivery of the video stream to the desktop, where a location of the cropped view

within a full video frame of the video stream is remotely selectable from the desktop via the control interface, which the combination of Dorough, Noonan et al., and Fellegara et al. do not describe.

Therefore, claim 15 patentably defines over Dorough in view of Noonan et al. and further in view of Fellegara et al. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 15 are respectfully requested. Dependent claims 16-17 and 19 depend from independent claim 15, and contain additional important aspects of the invention. Therefore, dependent claims 16-17 and 19 patentably define over Dorough in view of Noonan et al. and further in view of Fellegara et al. Reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 16-17 and 19 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, a system for inspecting a substrate, with an inspector having a sensor, a control interface, a network, a desktop for receiving the video stream and the control stream, a display and user interface controls to control operation of the inspector across the network, a compressor to selectively compress the video stream to a variable degree, a decimator to selectively down sample the video stream to a variable degree, a parser ***to selectively crop the video stream to a variable degree*** as specified through the user interface controls on the desktop, where the selective cropping reduces a size of the video stream, and a frame grabber to selectively set a frame rate of the video stream to a variable degree, where the compressor, decimator, parser, and frame grabber all reside within the inspector.

None of the three cited references describe selectively cropping the video stream ***to a variable degree*** as specified through the user interface controls on the desktop. Therefore, claim 20 patentably defines over Dorough in view of Noonan et al. and further in view of Fellegara et al. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 20 are respectfully requested.

Claim 18 is rejected over Dorough in view of Noonan et al. and further in view of Fellegara et al., and further yet in view of Lyon et al. Dependent claim 18 depends from independent claim 15, and therefore claims *inter alia*, a system for inspecting a substrate, with an inspector having a sensor, a control interface, a network, a desktop for receiving the video stream and the control stream, a display and user interface controls to control operation of the inspector across the network, a compressor to selectively compress the

video stream, a decimator to selectively down sample the video stream, a parser adapted to selectively crop the video stream prior to delivery of the video stream from the sensor to the desktop, where the selective cropping produces a cropped view and reduces a size of the video stream, and a *location* of the cropped view within a full video frame of the video stream *is remotely selectable* from the desktop via the control interface, and a codec to selectively set a frame rate of the video stream, where the decimator and the parser operate cooperatively to selectively down sample the video stream to a lesser degree when the video stream is selectively cropped to a higher degree, and to selectively down sample the video stream to a higher degree when the video stream is selectively cropped to a lesser degree.

Thus, claim 18 also claims the parser that selectively crops the video stream prior to delivery of the video stream to the desktop, where a location of the cropped view within a full video frame of the video stream is remotely selectable from the desktop via the control interface, which the combination of Dorough, Noonan et al., and Fellegara et al. do not describe.

Lyon et al. do not remedy this deficiency, in that Lyon et al. also do not describe the parser that selectively crops the video stream prior to delivery of the video stream to the desktop, where a location of the cropped view within a full video frame of the video stream is remotely selectable from the desktop via the control interface. Lyon et al. describe decimating an image (skipping rows of pixels) and displaying portions of an image on a lower resolution display. Neither of these things are considered in the art to be cropping, and they do not reduce a video stream size (they merely limit what of the video stream is displayed). In fact, Lyon et al. never use the word “crop,” or describe any action that reads on cropping, which is a well-defined term in the art.

Further, none of the references – either alone or in combination – describe the inverse relationship and selective balancing between the down sampling and cropping functions of the inspector, as claimed in claim 18.

Therefore, claim 18 patentably defines over Dorough in view of Noonan et al. and further in view of Fellegara et al. and further yet in view of Lyon et al. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 18 are respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that the claims of the present application patentably define over the prior art made of record and not relied upon for the same reasons as given above. Applicants respectfully submit that a full and complete response to the office action is provided herein, and that the application is now fully in condition for allowance. Action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

In the event this response is not timely filed, applicants hereby petition for the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are required by this response, such fees may be charged to deposit account 12-2252.

Sincerely,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By: 

Rick Barnes, 39,596

2008.06.26